

Inspector Committee
DSA Advisory Board
Final Minutes of Meeting
Thursday, September 1, 2005

California Community Colleges Building
1102 Q Street, 5th Floor, Conference Room B
Sacramento, California

Committee Members Present

Dennis Shallenberger, Chair
Stephanie Gonos, Vice Chair (arrived late)
Gino Bastianon
Paul Beyl
Kennith Hall
David Karina
Art Ross (arrived late)
Jim Ward (arrived late)

Committee Members Absent

Tom Shih

DSA Staff Present

Mary Ann Aguayo, Executive Director, DSA AB
John Baca
Dennis Bellet
Jeff Enzler
Eric France
Elizabeth Schroeder
David Thorman, State Architect

Others Present

Dan Cherrier, Kleinfelder
Cliff Craig, Dynamic Consultants & California
Council of Testing & Inspection Agencies
(CCTIA)
Terry Egland, Testing Engineers

I. Call to Order and Introductions

Committee Chair Dennis Shallenberger called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. and participants took turns introducing themselves.

II. Review of Prior Meeting Minutes & Follow-Up Items

Ms. Mary Ann Aguayo advised that the minutes of the last meeting were approved at the Board meeting. She noted all the follow-up items will be addressed individually except for the first one, regarding the inspector exam process.

Mr. Shallenberger advised that he would be preparing a summary of the committee's accomplishments and goals, and he welcomed input from committee members. He suggested discussing ideas under "New Business" later in the meeting.

Inspector Exam Process

Mr. John Baca said he had a few items to report regarding the inspector exam process.

First, Mr. Baca said, DSA had been turning away 50 to 70 applicants each testing period because there was not enough space. In the future, staff plans to allow all qualified applicants to take the exam, arranging for as much space as needed, and additional copies of the plan sets will be made available. Mr. Baca welcomed suggestions as to possible venues with more space for administering the exam. He noted the exam is currently being given in hotel ballrooms. Mr. Baca stated there are currently three venues in Los Angeles, but added that he would like to find a single room in Los Angeles large enough to hold about 200 people.

1 Mr. Gino Bastianon noted the architectural exam was given in a large building at the
2 Pomona Fairplex. Other committee members noted the Pomona facilities are large enough
3 to accommodate tables and chairs.

4
5 Committee members suggested school gymnasiums and auditoriums. Mr. Baca advised
6 that the staff contacted some community colleges, but most are completely booked for a
7 year or two.

8
9 Mr. Baca said the staff has been editing the application package to clarify the information
10 provided to applicants. He noted there is an explanation of the scoring system, but there is
11 no predetermined score that ensures passing. Candidates are informed that they need to
12 pass every section of each part by 60 percent to pass that part.

13
14 Mr. Baca reported that there had been some complaints and questions about qualifications.
15 He noted the criteria specify that qualifying experience in the construction category has to
16 be in the class for which the applicant is applying, and language explaining this will be
17 added inserted after the chart.

18
19 Mr. Baca advised that Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD)
20 inspectors must take the exam in order to qualify for DSA certification. Mr. Shallenberger
21 said the committee compared the certification levels and determined that OSHPD's
22 inspector classifications were equivalent to slightly lower classifications for DSA. Mr. Baca
23 noted that in response to a recommendation from the DSA Advisory Board, DSA published
24 a circular on the Website for a brief time in 2003, but it was eventually removed for revision.

25
26 Mr. Paul Beyl commented that this option was originally considered as a way of addressing
27 the severe shortage of DSA inspectors. He said he later learned there are plenty of
28 inspectors, so there may be no need to certify OSHPD inspectors.

29
30 Mr. Jeff Enzler added that when people learned about the new policy, there were some
31 complaints from inspectors who had met the DSA qualifications and passed the test.

32
33 Mr. Baca said DSA plans to post an official notice on the Website advising that DSA
34 Circular A-2 has not been in effect since December of 2003 and clarifying that OSHPD
35 inspectors must pass the DSA test to be certified.

36
37 Mr. Dennis Bellet spoke in favor of allowing OSHPD inspectors to obtain DSA certification.
38 He expressed his opinion that it would be advantageous for various state agencies to share
39 a pool of qualified inspectors. He questioned whether the committee's previous position
40 should be changed.

41
42 Mr. Ken Hall pointed out that the committee made a recommendation to the DSA Advisory
43 Board, which in turn made a recommendation to DSA. He remarked that it is up to the
44 State Architect to decide which recommendations to implement. Other committee
45 members agreed.

46
47 Mr. Shallenberger noted that if the committee wants to change its mind, the matter should
48 be agendized for discussion at a future meeting. He expressed his opinion that the issue
49 does not need to be revisited by the committee.

50
51
52 Mr. Beyl agreed there was no need to revisit the issue, but said he would like to review

1 specifically what the committee had recommended earlier. Mr. Shallenberger suggested
2 reviewing the minutes, and Mr. Beyl said he had copies of previous committee minutes.

3
4 Mr. Dave Karina commented that it is well known in the field that OSHPD does not screen
5 its applicants as well as DSA. He noted DSA verifies an applicant's experience, but
6 OSHPD is less rigorous.

7
8 Mr.ENZler said he recalled that the committee's recommendation was that DSA verify the
9 experience requirements for all OSHPD inspectors.

10
11 Committee members agreed there was no need to revisit this issue.

12
13 Mr. Baca noted other changes in the exam process include elimination of the extra fee
14 charged to applicants who apply for Class 2 and later request to be moved to Class 3,
15 eliminating the six-month waiting period for applicants who fail the Class 2 exam and want
16 to take the test for Class 3, and allowing a four- to six-week period for exam results. Mr.
17 Baca said the staff is working with some new e-tracker modules that allow test passage
18 rates to be calculated automatically. He added that the staff hopes this system will speed
19 up the process and allow applicants to receive results in about a month.

20
21 Mr. Baca said the staff is updating the Website to make sure all information is current. He
22 noted professionals will be hired to edit and revise the test questions to make sure they
23 reflect the actual duties of inspectors. Mr. Baca commented that some of the "tricky"
24 questions will be eliminated, and the questions will focus on testing what inspectors need to
25 know in the field.

26
27 Mr. Shallenberger asked if the staff had a chance to seek legal advice on the issue of
28 applicants requesting special accommodation. Mr. Baca replied that the current policy
29 allows time and a half for applicants who provide a note from a doctor. He noted the
30 wording is being clarified to specify "medical doctor."

31
32 Mr. Shallenberger thanked Mr. Baca for the update.

33 34 **III. Update and Discussion of Follow-Up Items**

35 **A. 05.01.18 Soil Testing Development**

36 Mr.ENZler drew attention to Circular 18-1, articulating DSA's policy for soil testing and
37 inspection. He said the policy clarifies that if a geotechnical engineer affiliated with an
38 Laboratory Evaluation and Acceptance (LEA)-accepted testing facility is unwilling to take
39 responsibility for a soils investigation report signed by another geotechnical engineer, it is
40 possible that both engineers could do testing and inspection; in this case, both engineers
41 would be required to submit verified reports. He noted the circular also defines what DSA
42 means by "observation" and "inspection."

43
44 Mr. Shallenberger recommended replacing "soils investigation" and "soils report" with the
45 term "soils engineering investigation" or "soils engineering report" throughout the circular.
46 He noted insertion of "engineering" distinguishes this kind of report from the work done by
47 landscape architects or environmental agencies.

48
49 Mr. Shallenberger drew attention to the fifth line of the first paragraph of the "Background"
50 section, and suggested replacing the word "performed" with "prepared."

1 Regarding the definition of “inspection,” Mr. Shallenberger noted the code requires “special
2 inspection” for “special grading,” which he interpreted to mean activities like testing of a
3 geogrid-reinforced wall backfill, inspection of the shear key for stabilization of a landslide, or
4 a canyon clean-out. Normal grading, on the other hand, requires professional observation
5 and testing, but not special inspection. Mr. Shallenberger said Mr. Eric France confirmed
6 that this was DSA’s position, but he interpreted “special grading” to apply to any fill
7 supporting a structure. Mr. Shallenberger suggested clarifying this issue.

8
9 Mr. Shallenberger asked if nuclear-gauge tests can be done by a representative of a
10 geotechnical engineer who is not necessarily attached to an LEA-approved lab. Mr. Enzler
11 confirmed that interpretation. Mr. Shallenberger expressed support for allowing
12 geotechnical engineers to do maximum density and sand cone testing as well. He
13 recommended clarifying these points.

14
15 Mr. Beyl proposed adding the words “and/or inspectors” in the third line of the bottom
16 paragraph on the first page after “laboratory technicians.”

17
18 Mr. Shallenberger recommended striking the word “supervision” from the last paragraph.
19 He clarified that testing and observation are different from supervising construction.

20
21 Mr. Hall requested that the staff add line numbers to future versions of the documents. Ms.
22 Aguayo advised that these documents are not processed through Advisory Board staff and
23 therefore is not involved in their preparation and formatting.

24
25 One meeting participant recommended allowing only LEA-accepted laboratories with
26 geotechnical engineers to conduct the soils tests. Mr. Shallenberger expressed his opinion
27 that independent geotechnical engineers should have the ability to perform the tests with
28 their own people, even if they are not affiliated with an LEA-approved lab.

29
30 Mr. Enzler pointed out that the reason for the LEA program in the first place is because
31 schools have special rules and special code requirements. He noted geotechnical
32 engineers who are not affiliated with LEA labs may be unfamiliar with continuous inspection
33 and other special requirements.

34
35 Mr. Shallenberger commented that engineers need flexibility to hire the best people for
36 testing. He added that he was not confident about the ability of some LEA’s to conduct
37 tests properly.

38
39 Mr. Art Ross concurred. He expressed his opinion it was irresponsible for an owner to hire
40 one engineer to do the investigation and foundation report and then hire someone else to
41 do the field investigation. He observed that although this is a bad practice, it is sometimes
42 done for cost reasons.

43
44 Mr. Cliff Craig pointed out the distinction between the qualifications of a geotechnical
45 engineer and those of their laboratory services. He said labs have different testing
46 responsibilities than engineers.

47
48 Mr. Shallenberger described a project in which his firm’s recommendations were
49 contradicted by another engineer, who recommended less excavation to save money. He
50 observed that allowing two engineers on a project will lead to similar disagreements. He
51 urged the staff to consider all of these factors before making a decision on whether there

1 should be exceptions to allow nuclear gauge, sand cone, and maximum density tests to be
2 performed in places other than a LEA-approved lab.

3
4 Mr. Bastianon concurred with Mr. Shallenberger. He advocated some system of
5 prequalifying independent engineers to work on DSA projects.

6
7 Mr. Shallenberger suggested taking a brief recess and then moving on to the next topic.

8
9 The committee took a short break.

10 11 **B. 05.02.01 Sampling & Testing of Materials**

12 Mr. Eric France reviewed Circular 17-1, regarding sampling and testing of materials. He
13 said there have been problems, especially in southern California, with materials tests being
14 conducted by project inspectors, assistant inspectors, and special inspectors who are not
15 employed by a DSA-approved testing laboratory. Circular 17-1 clarifies that the code
16 requires that custody of specimens and testing be handled by LEA-accepted facilities,
17 unless an alternative individual is approved in advance by DSA.

18
19 Mr. Shallenberger noted that on the DSA Website, the LEA program is found under "Project
20 Tracking." He suggested making it easier for users to find LEA information. Mr. France
21 said Website updates will be discussed as part of a later agenda item.

22
23 Mr. Shallenberger drew attention to the last bulleted item, noting testing it limited to the
24 "testing facility assigned to the project," implying that testing cannot be subcontracted. He
25 suggested inserting "or another LEA-approved subcontractor being utilized by that testing
26 laboratory."

27
28 Mr. Shallenberger said he thought the rest of the circular was very clear.

29
30 Mr. Beyl agreed that there was an issue with special inspectors and independent engineers
31 sometimes taking their own samples and handling materials. He added that there are
32 many advantages in having special inspectors work for LEA-accepted laboratories. Mr.
33 Shallenberger noted that issue would be covered under a later agenda item.

34
35 Mr. Craig cautioned that there are occasions when LEA labs need to use subcontractors,
36 but the LEA labs are still responsible for the final verified reports. Mr. Shallenberger
37 suggested rewording the last bulleted item to reflect this intent. He recommended also
38 specifying that the LEA lab cannot go beyond one level of subcontractors without DSA
39 approval.

40 41 **C. 05.02.02 Proposed New Structural Testing & Special Inspections List**

42 Mr. France drew attention to the new Structural Tests and Special Inspections Lists. He
43 noted the staff is considering adding back a couple items that were removed, such as Fire
44 Code compliance. He said the new form is intended to identify the required tests and
45 clarify reporting responsibilities. Mr. France pointed out the shaded box indicating DSA
46 approval status.

47
48 Mr. Enzler suggested adding a reference to the specific section of the specifications
49 defining each of the tests required.

50
51 Mr. Ross questioned whether people will take the time to cross-reference the lists with the
52 specifications. He asked whether DSA had had problems in this area, and whether the

1 specifications or lists would govern in cases where there were conflicts.

2
3 Mr.ENZler responded that there have been occasional problems when a test is required
4 in the specifications but not on the T&I list. He added that some labs will refer to the
5 specifications to verify which reports are required.

6
7 Mr. Shallenberger expressed his opinion that citing the specifications sections would be
8 very helpful.

9
10 Mr. Shallenberger observed that on both lists, the word "earthwork" is underlined in the
11 note with the asterisk, and he questioned the need for underlining.

12
13 Mr. Shallenberger drew attention to the sentence under "Material Test Reports" and the
14 signature lines, and noted the architect was called "project architect," but the engineer was
15 "structural engineer" rather than "project engineer." He suggested removing the word
16 "project" before "architect." After some discussion, committee members agreed that the
17 titles should be changed to "architect of record" and "structural engineer of record." After
18 "architect of record," Mr. Shallenberger suggested inserting the following: "(or structural
19 engineer or other design professional as appropriate").

20
21 Mr. Beyl suggested appending the T&I lists directly to the structural drawings. Mr.
22 Shallenberger said he would prefer to see the lists on the plans. Mr.ENZler commented
23 that putting the T&I lists on the plans would solve a myriad of problems. Mr. Shallenberger
24 recommended clarifying that the contractor is only responsible for coordinating the work
25 done by firms retained and paid for by the school district. Mr.ENZler noted the DSA
26 approval box and the signature line could be eliminated if the lists were on the plans.

27
28 Mr. France advised that it might be better to include the lists in the specifications. Mr. Beyl
29 pointed out that every project has a set of plans, but not every project has specifications.

30
31 Mr. Bastianon advocated putting the T&I lists on the drawings.

32
33 Mr. Dan Cherrier noted that mix design review had been omitted from the list of tests. Mr.
34 ENZler explained that DSA determined that mix design was not actually a test. Mr. Cherrier
35 recommended specifying that the testing lab still needs to do the mix review. Mr. Beyl and
36 Mr. Shallenberger concurred. Mr. Cherrier suggested adding grout testing to the list as
37 well.

38
39 Mr. Beyl suggested that DSA issue a circular clarifying that a lab engineer must review the
40 mix design. Mr. Ross expressed his opinion that structural engineers should also be
41 allowed reviewing the mix design.

42
43 Mr. Craig commented that mix design review has an enormous benefit for everyone on the
44 project. He expressed support for leaving mix design review on the list to call attention to
45 the requirement. He noted the specifications define what specific criteria must be met.

46
47 Mr. Beyl recommended requiring the mix design to be specified on the drawings.

48
49 Mr. Bastianon noted the T&I list is a major obstacle in project close-outs, and he asked
50 DSA to clarify its expectations.

1 Mr. Shallenberger observed that the committee's consensus was that the T&I list should be
2 included in the plans or specifications and that labs should review mix design. He
3 suggested it might be helpful to add specific tests under "Concrete."

4
5 Mr. Shallenberger proposed moving on to the next topic.

6
7 **D. 05.02.04 LEA Application (DSA Form 100-3)**

8 Mr. France stated that a new Item 15, Employee Qualification Matrix, was added to the
9 proposed LEA application form. He noted labs will be required to list their employees and
10 indicate their areas of certification and qualifications.

11
12 Mr. Shallenberger noted there are three spaces under Item 5, regarding branch offices and
13 subcontractors. He asked if a firm would be limited to using only the ones specified there.
14 Mr. France said the answer should reflect what the firm typically uses.

15
16 Mr. Enzler added that branch offices working on DSA projects need to apply independently
17 for LEA acceptance.

18
19 Mr. Hall suggested having LEA's file regular updates to Item 15 after certification. He noted
20 some labs have tremendous turnover, so the information should be kept current.

21
22 Mr. Enzler said DSA reviews and updates the information about every four years.
23 Committee members discussed the feasibility of having labs report more frequently. Mr.
24 Hall questioned the purpose of Item 5 and Item 15 if the information is not kept up to date.
25 Mr. Enzler explained that DSA uses the information in Item 15 to determine if a lab employs
26 special inspectors. Mr. Hall suggested asking that question directly.

27
28 Mr. Shallenberger commented that there is little turnover among the key people at his firm,
29 but soil technicians and inspectors tend to come and go. He noted most of the names
30 would remain on the list year after year. He said there are other requirements for LEA's to
31 notify DSA of any substantive changes once their applications are approved, and he
32 suggested addressing turnover that way.

33
34 Mr. Shallenberger noted Item 6e refers to "unconsolidated compressive strength." He
35 suggested replacing "unconsolidated" with "unconfined." He asked if DSA really cared
36 about Item 6i, California bearing ratio, or Item 6l, R. value/expansion. Mr. Shallenberger
37 recommended replacing those categories with expansion index and direct shear instead.

38
39 Mr. Shallenberger noted that the categories included on the list are only those tests that are
40 done during construction.

41
42 Mr. Shallenberger drew attention to Item 8x, and asked what was meant by "density of
43 lightweight." Mr. France said he thought the word "aggregate" should be added.

44
45 Mr. Shallenberger questioned whether Item 9g, "R-Meter Evaluation," should be included.

46
47 Mr. Shallenberger noted that both Items 12 and 13 contain magnetic particle, ultrasonic,
48 and liquid penetrant. He asked whether they were considered tests or inspections. Mr.
49 France responded that those items belonged under the tests in Item 12.

50
51 Referring to Item 14, Mr. Beyl suggested separating "Lumber" and "Roofing" into two
52 separate items. He noted clay roof tiles are included in the masonry tests under Item 10,

1 and he questioned whether that item should be put under the roofing item instead. Mr.
2 Enzler suggested putting clay tile roofs under "Roofing."

3
4 Mr. Beyl proposed making the numbering system of the applicant match standard
5 specification numbers used in the field. He suggested identifying the items as "Division 1,
6 "Division 2," and "Division 3," for example. Committee members expressed support for this
7 idea.

8
9 Mr. France said there is a new numbering system, the CSI format, that is being adopted
10 industry-wide.

11
12 Mr. Ross observed that the T&I list should refer to the specific ASTM standards and codes
13 listed in the application form. Mr. Shallenberger suggested discussing this topic in more
14 detail at a future meeting.

15
16 Mr. Craig suggested adding fireproofing and sprayed-on fireproofing. Committee members
17 observed that Item 13h addresses fireproofing.

18
19 Mr. Craig asked about proof-loading or torque testing of concrete anchors, and Mr. Enzler
20 directed his attention to Item 9e. Committee members recommended moving this item to
21 "Tests" rather than "Inspections."

22
23 Participants discussed the distinctions between project inspectors and special inspectors.

24
25 At 12:00 noon, the committee adjourned for lunch. Mr. Shallenberger reconvened the
26 meeting at 1:00 p.m.

27 28 **F. 05.02.06 LEA Program Website (Out of Order)**

29 Mr. Enzler drew attention to the handout entitled "Material Testing and Special Inspection,"
30 and invited committee members to review the proposed Website text. He noted the
31 information about the LEA program is under "Program Tracking," as mentioned earlier, and
32 staff recommends creating a new easy-to-find Web page specifically for testing lab
33 information. He said users will click on a "Materials Test Labs" tab on the main Web page
34 to access the page and its associated links.

35
36 Mr. Enzler noted the Website will include the actual list of approved facilities, report
37 templates and forms, IR 17-1, explaining the process requirements, and IR 17-2,
38 discussing roles and responsibilities during a project. He said the application form, an
39 instructional document, and a stakeholder news update will also be provided.

40
41 Mr. Shallenberger noted the committee previously talked about labs submitting reports to
42 DSA electronically, and he asked if the Web page would include that function. Mr. Enzler
43 responded that this Web page will be informational, but the staff hopes to implement an
44 electronic submittal process in the future.

45
46 Mr. Beyl recommended providing a list of current DSA circulars on the Website.

47
48 Mr. Shallenberger welcomed Mr. Ross back to the meeting and proposed returning to the
49 discussion of the LEA application.

50 51 **D. 05.02.04 LEA Application (DSA Form 100-3) (Continued)**

52 Mr. Shallenberger noted the committee had been talking about the distinction between

1 project inspectors and special inspectors. He pointed out that concrete is not included in
2 the T&I form because it is handled by project inspectors, unless DSA approves some other
3 agreement. Committee members discussed Title 24 requirements pertaining to special
4 inspections.

5
6 Mr. France advised that Mr. Chip Smith is in charge of DSA's code implementation effort,
7 and there is an electronic system for providing feedback on proposed code amendments,
8 and he encouraged interested people to use that vehicle. Mr. Ross noted that Mr. Chip
9 Smith is sent notices inviting people to submit comments.

10
11 Looking at Item 16, Mr. Shallenberger observed that the first numbered point talks about
12 projects that "are qualified and will be adequately supervised," but subsequent points use
13 "shall be" instead of "is" or "are." He recommended using "is" and "are" throughout.

14
15 In the next-to-last paragraph, Mr. Shallenberger suggested changing the word "understood"
16 to "understand." He noted the last sentence talked about "revocation of DSA's acceptance
17 of this lab facility," and proposed using "testing facility," consistent with previous
18 terminology.

19
20 Mr. Shallenberger noted the second sentence at the top of the form is not feasible. He
21 suggested changing the language to say, "I will personally perform all engineering
22 management responsibilities . . . or they will be performed under my direction."

23
24 Mr. Hall questioned whether the mandatory "shall" language should be changed to "is." Mr.
25 Shallenberger advocated using "shall" consistently throughout.

26
27 Mr. Craig said testing labs are concerned about Item 15, the employee matrix, because of
28 the legal issues raised by providing specific names. He recommended finding a better way
29 of providing the information DSA needs to evaluate a lab's qualifications. Mr. Hall strongly
30 agreed.

31
32 Mr. Shallenberger noted it might be helpful to specify the list is accurate as of a certain
33 date.

34
35 Mr. Hall recommended asking directly about whether the firm has qualified staff to do the
36 required testing.

37
38 Mr.ENZler expressed a willingness to work with CCTIA to resolve concerns on this issue.

39 40 **E. 05.02.05 Various LEA Program Report Draft Templates**

41 Mr. France referred to the proposed template for a laboratory verified report and welcomed
42 comments. He said the templates have gone out to all the stakeholders for their review,
43 but there have been no comments, except regarding the Laboratory Verified Report.
44 Committee members discussed the wording of the certification.

45
46 Mr. Shallenberger noted the Board of Registration might have a problem with engineers
47 certifying they "have read the above report." He suggested changing the language to
48 indicate the report was prepared by the engineer or under the engineer's direct supervision.
49 He noted the seal should be moved toward the left so the signature can be placed across
50 the seal.

1 Mr. Shallenberger said he thought the term “professional engineer” was now used in place
2 of “civil engineer.” Mr. France said the title should be “licensed professional engineer.” Mr.
3 Shallenberger asked the staff to verify the correct terminology.

4
5 Mr. Shallenberger commented that it is impossible for an engineer to certify everything
6 contained in the proposed wording. He suggested that DSA consider a code change to
7 bring what engineers are required to sign in accordance with other professions.

8
9 Mr. Ross agreed, noting that engineers deal in the realm of opinion and professional
10 judgment. He proposed adding a qualifier such as “to the best of my knowledge.” Mr.
11 Shallenberger said he had no problem with that approach. Mr.ENZler pointed out that the
12 qualifier weakens the statement.

13
14 Mr. Craig said the industry has debated this issue for some time. He suggested trying to
15 find some common ground that serves DSA’s purpose without creating problems for
16 certifying engineers. As an alternative to the language in the first sentence, he proposed
17 saying that the work done by the laboratory was done in accordance with the specifications.
18 Committee members discussed various options.

19
20 Mr. Shallenberger expressed his opinion that the project inspector should be responsible
21 for making sure the proper tests are done. He said DSA feels the labs should be reviewing
22 the plans and specs. He suggested seeking input from SEAOC, California Geotechnical
23 Engineers, and AIA regarding this issue.

24
25 Mr. Craig observed that the items certified also need to be tied in to the T&I list.

26
27 Mr. Beyl stated that the project inspector is responsible to ensure that all required, code-
28 mandated tests and inspections are performed; the contractor is responsible to coordinate
29 the testing and inspection and obtain the necessary signoffs.

30
31 Mr. Shallenberger proposed revisiting this item at the next meeting.

32
33 Mr. France distributed copies of IR 17-1, “Laboratory Evaluation and Acceptance (LEA)
34 Process,” describing the minimum qualifications and rules for LEA’s. He noted IR 17-1 will
35 be accompanied by IR 17-2, which defines the practices and responsibilities of test labs.

36 37 **Other Follow-Up Items**

38 Mr. Shallenberger asked about the status of provisions regarding the inspector disciplinary
39 process. Mr.ENZler said a number of comments had been received, and the staff will be
40 developing a revised version.

41
42 Mr. Shallenberger asked about the LEA disciplinary procedures, and Mr.ENZler responded
43 that the staff was working on those as well.

44
45 Mr. Shallenberger noted one of the committee’s follow-up items has to do with electronic
46 submittals. Mr.ENZler said DSA has a pilot project underway for architects to submit
47 documents.

48
49 Mr. Shallenberger said the follow-up list indicates the staff was planning to revise IR A-8,
50 regarding inspector duties. Mr.ENZler said that task still needs to be done. Mr.
51 Shallenberger proposed discussing this topic at the next meeting.

1 **IV. Plan to Address Inspection of Elevators**

2 Mr. Shallenberger noted the Board recently heard an appeal recently involving elevators,
3 and Mr. Lowell Shields asked for clarification as to whether DSA feels elevators are being
4 adequately inspected. He said the committee began discussing the issue, but it was tabled
5 pending appointment of a new State Architect. Mr. Shallenberger suggested it might be
6 appropriate for the committee to take up the matter again. He asked the staff to consult
7 with the State Architect to determine whether this issue should be addressed now.

8
9 Ms. Aguayo said she had been consulting with Mr. Baca and Mr. Dennis Bellet, and Mr.
10 Bellet agreed that this issue needed to be addressed, but there was no determination as to
11 the committee's involvement. She suggested that the committee ask the DSA Advisory
12 Board for direction on this matter.

13
14 Mr.ENZler observed that the elevator appeal also involved the larger issue of out-of-state
15 fabrication, which applies to light poles, bleachers, steel joists, and other components. He
16 said Circular A-1 clarifies inspection requirements, so it might be helpful for the committee
17 to review that document as a starting point for the discussion.

18
19 Mr. Shallenberger entertained a motion to ask the full Board whether the committee should
20 look further into the issue of elevator construction and elevator construction, as previously
21 directed, and whether the inquiry should be expanded to include all out-of-state fabrication
22 and inspection items.

23
24 **Ms. Stephanie Gonos made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hall, to ask the DSA Advisory**
25 **Board to provide direction as proposed.**

26
27 Mr. Bastianon said there are often conflicts with DSA regarding use of pre-manufactured
28 items because of the continuous inspection requirement.

29
30 Mr. Shallenberger asked if any other committees were dealing at this issue. Participants
31 noted the Building Standards Committee had been looking at glu lam beams and pre-
32 approved items. Committee members discussed difficulties in ensuring quality control over
33 items manufactured out of state.

34
35 Mr. Shallenberger proposed voting on the motion regarding elevators and out-of-state
36 fabrication, and then considering a separate motion regarding pre-approved items. He
37 clarified that the pending motion calls for the committee to ask the DSA Advisory Board if
38 the committee should take up the issue of elevator inspection, as previously directed, and
39 whether the topic should be expanded to include out-of-state and out-of-country inspection
40 issues. Mr. Shallenberger recalled that the committee was also asked to determine any
41 gaps between what OSHA inspects and what DSA inspects.

42
43 **The motion was carried unanimously.**

44
45 Mr. Shallenberger entertained a motion to ask the Board whether the committee should
46 take up the issue of pre-fabricated items. After some discussion, committee members
47 concluded this issue was best left to the staff.

48
49 **V. Meeting Summary/Next Steps**

50 Mr. Shallenberger noted all of the items on the Committees follow-up list had been
51 addressed.

1 Mr. Shallenberger observed that this committee tends to act in an advisory capacity to staff,
2 providing input on specific issues. He noted some of the main topics considered so far
3 have been a disciplinary process for inspectors and labs, the inspector exam process, and
4 the LEA program.

5
6 Mr. Shallenberger invited committee members to contact him before the next Board
7 meeting with suggestions and ideas about points to include in his annual summary of the
8 committee's activities. Ms. Aguayo said her records show the committee met three times
9 during the past year.

10
11 Mr. Craig thanked the committee for inviting industry representatives to participate and
12 provide input. Mr. Shallenberger thanked the guests for attending.

13
14 Mr. Ross acknowledged and thanked DSA staff for their hard work.

15
16 **VI. Public Comments**

17 Mr. Craig said CCTIA is interested in regulatory changes, and industry representatives look
18 forward to providing input on specific code changes.

19
20 Mr. Shallenberger encouraged CCTIA to work with the California Geotechnical Engineers
21 on issues affecting testing labs and geotechnical engineering.

22
23 **VII. New Business**

24 Mr. Enzler said DSA is sending out emails and mailers to LEA-accepted labs inviting their
25 participation in the code amendment process via an electronic feedback system.

26
27 Ms. Aguayo noted there will be a presentation on the electronic feedback process at the
28 Board's annual meeting on October 14 at the Kellogg Conference Center in Pomona.

29
30 Mr. Shallenberger drew attention to the "Ultrasonic Testing" article that appeared in the
31 June issue of the *CASH Register*. He said the article characterizes the UT industry as
32 being corrupt and fraudulent. He provided a copy of CCTIA's August 22 response.

33
34 Mr. Shallenberger noted DSA might consider offering some kind of official response as
35 well. He suggested a motion from the committee to bring the article to the Advisory Board's
36 attention. Ms. Aguayo advised that all these materials will be part of the Board's meeting
37 packet.

38
39 Mr. Shallenberger expressed his opinion that there were indeed a few incompetent and
40 unscrupulous firms, but inspections are done competently and appropriately by most firms.
41 He added that his firm planned to send a response letter, and he encouraged others to
42 respond.

43
44 Mr. Ross noted he was president of SEAOC when the Northridge earthquake happened,
45 and one lesson learned from that event was that UT testing is subjective and requires
46 qualified testers. He observed that some of the statements made in the magazine article
47 are defamatory and misleading.

48
49 Mr. Shallenberger acknowledged the arrival of Mr. David Thorman, State Architect.

1 **VIII. Schedule Next Meeting**

2 Mr. Shallenberger proposed setting a date for the next meeting. Committee members
3 decided to hold a meeting in early December. After some discussion, they agreed on
4 Tuesday, December 6, 2005, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in Sacramento.

5

6 **IX. Adjournment**

7 There being no further business, Mr. Karina made a motion that the meeting be adjourned.
8 The motion was seconded by Mr. Ward, unanimously approved, and the Inspector
9 Committee meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.